

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,037	07/10/2003	Hong-Seok Lee	NAW0020US	9800
23413 CANTOR CO	7590 06/14/201 I BURN LLP	EXAMINER		
20 Church Stre		BODDIE, WILLIAM		
	22nd Floor Hartford, CT 06103		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
manora, er o			2629	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/14/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/616,037	LEE ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	WILLIAM L. BODDIE	2629		

	WILLIAM L. BODDIE	2629						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 03 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.						
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of th application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 766.07(if MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 766.07(if MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 766.07(if MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set for thin (b) above, if checket. A vary reply received by the Office letter than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CPR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-32 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s): 7. Would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancel.								
non-allowable claim(s). Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	will not be entered, or b) wil	•						
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).					
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowan	ce because:					
Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (Other:	P10/58/08) Paper No(s)							
	/William L Boddie/ Examiner, Art Unit 2629							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not persuasive.Applicants' argue that the non-display periods of Sato are not analogous to the non-display periods of Baba. Specifically Applicants' argue that the non-display periods of Sato refer not to LCD driving signals but rather to times of backlight emission.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. It seems clear from figures 11A-D and the discussion of them in column 17, that the LCD panel does not display any light. Sato specifically drives a second a 2nd non-video signal onto the pixel electrodes. That signal causes the LCD to display no light, note the transmittance waveforms in figure 11C. It is this application of a 2nd non-video signal after the display period that is seen as being incorporated into the display waveform of Baba. In short, Sato certainly seems to apply a voltage to the pixel electrodes that works to display no-light as evidenced by the transmittance curves. This voltage is applied by the display drivers and hence would seem to satisfy the requirement that the display panel be driven to display no light.

As shown above, the rejections are seen as proper and are thus maintained...